DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 142 662 UD 017 180

AUTHOR Dederick, Judith G.; And Others

TITLE Follow Through Program 1975-1976.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Div. of Educational Planning and Support.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 73p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 0961672

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Health Services; *Instructional Programs; Parent Participation; *Program Content; *Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Social Services
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *New York (New York); *Project Follow Through

ABSTRACT

This paper describes and evaluates the Follow Through Program in New York City. Although centrally coordinated at the Center for School Development of the Board of Education of the City of New York, each Follow Through Program is based on a different educational model, and in all cases but one, each model is sponsored by an educational institution or agency independent of the Board of Education. This evaluation report is based on two major sources of information. One is a series of over 100 site visits to each Follow Through Program in a public school. Interviews with staff members were an important component of site visits. The second source of information for this evaluation is reading test results from 1975-1976 and previous years for both Follow Through children and a control group of non-Follow Through children. Major sections of this report include: (1) a description of the characteristics of Follow Through which form the philosophical core of the program, (2) an evaluation of out-of-classroom segments of the program such as health services, (3) an examination of instructional programs, and (4) evaluations of programs at each individual site. Generally it was found that the Follow Through Program met its goals. Reading scores were higher for Follow Through as compared to non-Follow Through students. When the programs were observed individually, it was found that certain models functioned systematically better than other models. The goals of most of the social services were met despite reductions in the number of professional personnel. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED142662

EVALUATION REPORT

FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAM 1975-1976

Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I

Function Number 0961672

prepared by:

Judith Garrettson Dederick, Ph.D.

statistical design and analysis by:

Harry J. Clawar, Ph.D.

instrument development and data preparation by:

Victor Toledo

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Pl 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1975-76 school year.

UD017180

Board of Education of the City of New York
Division of Educational Planning and Support
Center for School Development

in consultation with
Office of Educational Evaluation

AUGUST 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
i.	List of Tables	ii
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Characteristics Common to All New York City Follow Through Programs	4
III.	Evaluation of the Out-of-Classroom Segments of All Follow Through Programs	6
	A. Health Services	6
	B. Social and Psychological Services	8
	C. Parent Involvement in Follow Through	11
IV.	The Instructional Program	22
	A. The Instructional Models and Roles of the Sponsors	22
	B. The Teachers	27
	C. Other Classroom Personnel	32
	D. Staff Training and Development	34
	E. Instructional Materials	35
	F. Trips	36
	G. Reading Achievement	39
	H. Achievement in Other Cognitive Areas	52
	I. Affective Development of the Children	53
	J. The Third Grade	55
V.	The Individual Programs	59
VI.	Conclusions, Summary, and Recommendations	64
VII.	Appendices	69
	A. Appendix A: The Follow Through Schools and Their Sponsors	69

TABLES

Page

1. Proportions of Teachers Rated "Good to Excellent" and "Poor" at Each Follow Through Site..... 29

2. Expenditures for Family Trips Included in Policy Advisory Committees' Proposed 1975-76 Budgets..... 38

3. Comparison of Spring 1976 Reading Test Results With Those Predicted by Historical Regression from 1975 Pretests..... 40

4. Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades K, 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never..... 42

5. Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never..... 45

6. Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades 2, 3, and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never..... 46

7. Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades 3 and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never..... 47

8. Analysis of Variance to Compare Reading Scores of Children Who Had Had Preschool Experiences With Those Who Had Little or No Preschool; Children Had Been in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never..... 48

9. Relationships Between Attendance and Reading Scores in Follow Through Classes, Grades K, 1, 2, and 3..... 50

10. Analysis of Attendance Data for Follow Through Children, Grades K, 1, 2, and 3..... 51

11. Percent of Teachers in Each Grade Rated "Good to Excellent," "Fair," and "Poor" in Follow Through..... 56

Chapter I

Introduction

The Follow Through Program in New York City is based in schools in disadvantaged neighborhoods in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx. Although centrally coordinated at the Center for School Development of the Board of Education of the City of New York, each Follow Through Program is based on a different educational model, and in all cases but one, each model is sponsored by an educational institution or agency independent of the Board of Education. The sponsors provide the model, program development and staff training for their programs. This means that the Follow Through Programs in New York City have some characteristics in common, and that each program has some unique features.

This evaluation report is based on two major sources of information. One is a series of site visits to each Follow Through Program in a public school, which were made by the author of this report. Initial site visits were made in the early Spring of 1976, and one or more follow-up visits were made near the end of the 1975-76 school year. A large proportion of the day during each site visit was devoted to observing Follow Through classes. Over one hundred classroom visits were made. The major goals of these observations were: (1) to determine whether the instructional model of the program was being followed in each class if a specific in-class instructional format was included in the educational model followed by the program; (2) to evaluate the teaching by the teachers, paraprofessionals, and parent trainees and parent volunteers when they were in the classes, and (3) to observe and evaluate the behaviors of the children in the classes. Interviews with Follow Through staff members were another important component of site visits; these included Follow Through coordi-

nators, teachers, secretaries, staff trainers, nurses, social workers, psychologists, family assistants and parent program assistants. School principals and assistant principals were interviewed when possible, and if a site visit coincided with a special Follow Through event such as the presentation of a travelling puppet show or graduation ceremonies for parent aides, those too were observed. Family Rooms and Resource Rooms were visited, their uses were observed, and people there were interviewed. Finally, many mothers involved in Follow Through Programs were interviewed, especially with reference to the activities of the parents' groups and their relationships to the school program. Where it was possible, recommendations for short-term improvements in the classroom instruction aspects of the program were given to the Follow Through coordinator at the end of the first site visit, and those improvements were especially sought after during subsequent visits.

The second source of information for this evaluation is reading test results from 1975-76 and previous years for both Follow Through children and a control group of non-Follow Through children.

Five major sections are included in this report. First, the introduction. Second, the characteristics of Follow Through which form the philosophical core of the program are described. Third, the out-of-classroom segments of the program, such as health services and parent group activities are evaluated, and recommendations for improvement are made. Basically, the out-of-classroom aspects of Follow Through are excellent. Fourth, the instructional program is examined. Classroom instruction in the program ranges from excellent to unacceptable and varies with the site. The components of the instructional program are discussed separately, and more

recommendations are made. The last major section of this report includes a brief evaluation of the program at each individual site. Finally, a list of all of the recommendations included in this report appears in an Appendix for easy reference.

Chapter II

Characteristics Common to All New York City Follow Through Programs

The Follow Through philosophy is that education for disadvantaged children must be as comprehensive as possible in order to be effective. Thus, the program supplies not only extra classroom personnel and extra staff training and development for Follow Through teachers, but also a myriad of other services. Each program has a full-time nurse who provides a large number of services to the children and their families. Each program originally had a full-time social worker and a psychologist either part or full-time. Recent budget cuts have led to major reductions in social and psychological services, but they are still more available to Follow Through families than to other families.

Finally, all Follow Through Programs have worked hard to involve parents in the school. A Policy Advisory Committee consisting mostly of parents, is active in each Follow Through Program. The Policy Advisory Committee chairperson, usually the mother of a Follow Through child, is at the school in the Family Room daily in almost all cases. Parents are strongly encouraged to assist in the classrooms, and those who volunteer to do so are trained either in the classrooms themselves or in special workshops. Some parents receive stipends to participate in these training programs. In addition, the Follow Through Programs have a continuous series of family-oriented activities including family trips, special programs and workshops for parents at the school. In each school a Family Room is maintained, in which parents, especially mothers, meet to socialize and to work in projects such as sewing lessons and arts and crafts workshops.

The staff development and program coordination at each Follow Through site

is carried out by a teacher assigned full-time as coordinator, a full-time Follow Through secretary, and at least one teacher assigned full-time as a staff trainer. The coordinators not only supervise the development of their own programs and oversee their day-by-day operation, they also act in liaison with community groups, other Follow Through Programs, their individual sponsors, and the Center for School Development at the Board of Education. The staff trainers' principal role is to assist the classroom teachers to implement the instructional model followed by the particular program. Recently, this has meant that the staff trainers have had to train many teachers who had never been part of Follow Through before. In addition, staff trainers have a major part in the training of paraprofessionals and parent volunteers. They work directly with the sponsor representatives to develop curricula and to address problems which have come up in the classrooms. They collect evaluative data for the sponsors and assist in the day-to-day operation of the classes. Some staff trainers do individual or small-group work with children who need remediation or who have trouble functioning in a whole-class setting. Many of them develop curriculum materials for the teachers to use.

The other components of the Follow Through Program are nutrition, which includes parent training and classroom lessons, as well as particular attention to the meals and snacks served to the children; the provision of extra materials and equipment to Follow Through classes; and an attempt to draw upon community resources to meet the children's needs and to teach the parents how to use community resources themselves.

Chapter III

Evaluation of the Out-of-Classroom Segments of All Follow Through Programs

Both within and outside the classroom, some aspects of the Follow Through Program are very strong. Outside the classroom, there are major strengths in the health services, the social and psychological services, and the parent programs.

Health Services

Each Follow Through Program has a full-time nurse whose job is to provide health services for the children in the program. Interviews with the nurses, and observation of their work, suggest that they place as broad an interpretation as possible on their jobs and then work exceptionally hard to fulfill their goals.

The nurses begin by being available to take care of the usual cuts, scratches, and bumps with which children come to them. They make a point of being in their offices before and after school and at lunchtime, when parents often bring their children in. The nurses not only work with the immediate problems presented by the parents, they also use these contacts to teach the parents basic principles of health care, to remind the parents when their children are due for check-ups and immunizations, to follow up on previous health care discussions, and to maintain rapport with both the children and their parents. Observation suggests that the Follow Through nurses are deeply trusted by parents, and that the parents ask questions freely. One mother was observed bringing her two children to the nurse because she thought one had a fever. She said that she couldn't read a thermometer. The nurse ascertained that the mother had a thermometer, (otherwise, she would have given her one), and then taught the mother to take her son's

temperature. Since the boy had a high fever, the nurse gave the mother a referral slip for the nearest medical clinic, checked to be sure that the mother knew how to get there and would go immediately, and sent them on their way. This example is typical of the nurses' family work.

Another health service job performed by Follow Through nurses is to do yearly height, weight, and vision screening for all children in the program. Many nurses (in conjunction with their program coordinators) have also solicited a wide range of free health services from hospitals, clinics, doctors, and dentists in their communities. Thus, many Follow Through children have received free dental checkups and dental care, blood testing for sickle cell anemia and other diseases, free eye-glasses, and so on. The nurses not only arrange for these services, but also arrange to get the children to the clinics, send reports to the parents, and keep extensive records for every child. Some nurses have secured donations of toothbrushes, toothpaste, thermometers, and other materials for the children.

Yet, another part of the Follow Through nurse's work is to do health education teaching, primarily in the children's classes, but also in parent workshops. Using filmstrips, charts, and other materials, the nurses make such presentations as nutrition, dental care, and first aid to the children, and other subjects such as weight control and childhood diseases to parents.

In interviews, several nurses said that the most difficult parts of their jobs were to convince both parents and children of the importance of good nutrition and dental care, and to get parents to follow up on referrals of their children to agencies for attention to specific health problems. The

nurses send regular reminders of such checkups to parents, and they insist on receiving reports from them. This process is greatly facilitated by the nurses' knowing many if not most of the families and being able to give verbal reminders as well whenever the parents or children are encountered.

In summary, the health services provided in the Follow Through Program are excellent. The major responsibility for these services rests with the program nurses, who organize and supervise the health services and also provide crucial personal warmth and support for the children and their parents. The nurses report that, except for the hours of work required for their extensive record-keeping, they find their jobs deeply satisfying. They are to be especially commended for making the effort to know the children and their families individually, and for obtaining all of the extra services and materials for their programs that they do. It is strongly recommended that a full-time nurse continue to be a member of each Follow Through team. In addition, the same nurse should continue in each program from year to year in order to have continuity in personal relationships with the families and professional relationships with the Follow Through team in the school and the health services professionals in the community. A final recommendation was suggested by some of the nurses, who said that they would like to have a regularly-scheduled health lesson in each class, perhaps once a month or once every two weeks.

Social and Psychological Services

Professional social workers and psychologists and paraprofessional family assistants make up the core of the social and psychological services team in Follow Through. Recent budget cuts have sharply reduced these services,

but they are still more available to Follow Through than to non-Follow Through children.

Interviews with social and psychological services team members, observations of their work, and discussions with teachers and other Follow Through staff members led to the conclusion that the services which are available are used heavily and are very constructive.

The social workers and family assistants work closely with the nurses as well as with the psychologists and teachers. They try to make home visits to each Follow Through family when the child is in his or her first year of Follow Through. They then focus their attention on children and families who need help. Sometimes a family member asks for help, sometimes a teacher makes a refusal, or sometimes a contact is initiated because the child is absent or late too often. When a family crisis occurs, the social worker helps the family get aid from appropriate agencies.

When a Follow Through Program still has a full-time social worker, that person's services are extremely valuable. The social workers who were interviewed and observed were highly skillful in talking with parents and children, and, as is true of the nurses, these social workers are trusted by the parents. The social workers are very familiar with the resources of the Follow Through communities, and were observed counseling parents about how to get what they needed from various agencies as well as telling them where to go for what kinds of help. The social workers also seemed skillful at supervising the family assistants so that they too could provide as many services as possible.

Where psychologists still are assigned to Follow Through Programs, it is

on a part-time basis except in the largest program which had a full-time psychologist this year. (She expected to be transferred at the end of the year.) Thus psychological services are currently very limited. Basically, the psychologists have time for almost nothing more than observing a few children in their classes, doing some individualized testing, and making referrals. They try to work with the social services staff and the teachers, but they are so overextended that they are not able to be as deeply involved with any one child or family as they might like.

Many of the family assistants have been involved in Follow Through since its inception in 1968-69. By and large they are industrious, dedicated workers who live in the community and relate easily to both parents and children. Again and again, the out-of-classroom Follow Through staff members and the teachers spontaneously told of the invaluable help they have received from these staff members. The family assistants themselves (some of whom have other titles, such as Family Associate and Family Worker) speak with genuine enthusiasm about their jobs. Many of them were trained in an inservice format for this work, and they feel very competent and successful. They receive frequent praise from their co-workers, another indication of their importance.

In all, the social and psychological services staff of the Follow Through Programs make important contributions to the Follow Through families and schools. More professional time is sorely needed. As is true of the nurses, continuity in terms of day-by-day and year-by-year presence is mandatory in order for familiarity and rapport to be continued. The great success of a bilingual social worker in involving the Hispanic parents in Follow Through in one school this year leads to the further

recommendation that bilingualism be considered as a strong asset in other schools with large Spanish-speaking populations.

Parent Involvement in Follow Through

A central hypothesis of the Follow Through Program is that children learn to work for self-improvement and to aspire to upward mobility through following their parents' examples. Therefore, the Follow Through Program is designed to involve parents directly in the school program, not only in order to help their children but also in order to help themselves achieve more education, better jobs, and a higher standard of living. This involvement takes many forms, some of which are common to all programs. Others have been designed to meet the unique needs of one or two educational models, and exist only at the sites at which those models are being implemented.

Overall, the Follow Through Programs are remarkably successful at achieving parent involvement. Some aspects of the program are more effective than others. The most immediately obvious success, upon entering any Follow Through school, is that the parents feel free to come into the school and seem at ease there. Many speak readily with their children's teachers and with the principal and others. The Family Rooms are bright, attractive and well used. Children usually know when their mothers are in the Family Room, and they are proud when they are there. Teachers were occasionally observed to suggest that a child go to the Family Room to talk something over with his or her mother. There is an easy ambiance in these rooms. The parents socialize, often while tending their younger children. Everyone is welcome, including teachers, school administrators, other Follow Through staff, and visitors.

The Policy Advisory Council of each program consists mainly of parents, and its officers are all parents. The Policy Advisory Council was designed to give parents and community members some direct effect in the design and execution of Follow Through. Originally, for instance, each Policy Advisory Council had a major voice in the selection of the educational model and sponsor for its school. During the past year, the Policy Advisory Councils choose and organized all of their own activities, which included writing and managing their own budgets. They also served as advisors to the Follow Through administration of each program, discussing possible programmatic changes. In mid-year, Follow Through Policy Advisory Council's and other parents had a city-wide conference at the Loeb Student Center of New York University. Parents' groups set up displays and gave demonstrations of their work and also met to discuss their programs. The conference was judged both by the parents and by the central Follow Through administration to have been highly successful.

The educational programs chosen by each Policy Advisory Council apparently reach a very limited number of parents. Workshops were given during the year on such topics as nutrition, breast cancer detection, arts and crafts, and weight reduction, among others. Interviews with Policy Advisory Council chairpersons led to the conclusion that average attendance at any workshop was twelve at most. Parents who did attend were enthusiastic.

Observations and interviews with Policy Advisory Council members, other parents, and Follow Through staff members suggest that the proportion of parents who participate in the Policy Advisory Councils themselves is quite small. On the other hand, many if not most of those who do partici-

pate become very involved, learn a variety of new skills, and grow in self-esteem. All of these are major goals of Follow Through.

Parents are involved in their children's classes through Parent Training and Parent Volunteer programs. These programs have varied over the years according to funding, UFT union regulations, and the evolution of the various instructional programs. Parents are involved in these programs much more in some schools than in others. At the beginning of the Follow Through Program, many of the paraprofessionals in the classrooms were Follow Through parents, who were recruited and trained from the communities for those full-time jobs. The intent was to provide a career ladder, in which parents could begin either as volunteers or as paid paraprofessionals and advance to higher-level jobs either in teaching or elsewhere. The paras' education was paid for, through the Bachelor's degree. What happened in fact was that many paras liked their jobs and simply chose to stay in them. While this has some distinct advantages, the problem it presents is that there are now no paraprofessional positions open to current Follow Through parents.

Parent volunteers are much more in evidence in some programs than in others. This is due in part to the fact that some instructional models call for these volunteers to fill specific classroom roles, and thus volunteers are more urgently recruited. Another factor is that some volunteers receive minimal stipends for inservice training days; these stipends pay for baby-sitters and incidental expenses as well as providing incentive.

In those programs in which parent trainees and parent volunteers were observed assisting in classrooms, their work was impressive. In the schools

in which the Behavior Analysis and Systematic Use of Behavioral Principles models are used, the parents have very specific teaching tasks to perform with small groups of children and they do so conscientiously and usually skillfully. At the school using the Bank Street model, the parents have more varied and less specific roles, and they are trained in the principles of the whole-child developmental model. A graduation ceremony for sixteen of these parent trainees was observed in June, and the pride and sense of accomplishment demonstrated by the parents was moving.

In the school using the Home-School Partnership model, the paraprofessionals spend each afternoon making home visits, the purposes of which are to teach parents how to help their children in school and how to make inexpensive but attractive and useful things for their homes. Thus parents are less frequently in the school, and their actual application of their learnings is difficult to assess.

Follow Through parents receive frequent newsletters, invitations to school programs, workshops, and meetings, and flyers about programs and services available to them. Every effort is made to alert parents to the services of community agencies, and to encourage them to take advantage of those services. Educational opportunities are emphasized particularly, and representatives from community schools, colleges, and training agencies are frequently invited to speak at parent meetings. A number of parents apparently use as much information about local services as they can; a much smaller number follow up specifically on educational opportunities. Those who do so receive a great deal of continuing support from the local Follow Through Program, and Follow Through staff speak with deep pride of the parents who have gone to school and improved their lives.

Most of the "parents" who participate in Follow Through are mothers. The relatively minor involvement of the children's fathers in any aspect of Follow Through is a continuing problem, which has been directly addressed by a few programs but, to date, solved by none. The fachers who do participate are usually involved in the Policy Advisory Council. Very few are in evidence in the school during the day. Follow Through coordinators said that attempts to organize special father-child activities such as fathers' breakfasts or father-child trips met with little success because fathers did not come. Two schools' Policy Advisory Councils included father-child trips in their budgets for 1975-76: one, a school with 13 Follow Through classes, proposed to send 10 fathers and 20 boys to a sports activity; the other, with 23 classes, proposed to send 12 fathers and 37 children on each of two trips. For family trips, many more adults were planned for; presumably most of them are mothers.

The reasons for the absence of fathers from Follow Through appear to be so numerous that the problem seems insoluble. First, some of these children infrequently see or hear from their fathers. In those families which include fathers or stable father-substitutes, many of the men work during the day. Furthermore, the parts of the Follow Through Program in which the children are directly involved is heavily dominated by women. Although 7 of the 8 Follow Through schools have male principals with whom the children sometimes interact, most communicating situations require them going to the Follow Through coordinators, 7 out of 8 of whom are women. Of 107 Follow Through teachers in Spring 1976, only 6, or 5.6%, were men. Four of the eight Follow Through programs had 100% female teachers, and only one program had more than one male teacher. No male paraprofessionals were

observed, although a few may exist and have been out of the school on the days of site visits. A few male teacher aides were in the classrooms, but they were extremely rare. This female dominance in the school echoes the female dominance of a large number of the households in the community. It establishes the schools as women's places in communities in which adult men often have difficulty in clearly defining their roles and finding motivating activies within the academic structure.

All of the above suggests that the endeavors to invclve fathers in Follow Through should be directed to the adult-centered aspects of the program.

Another problem for the parents involved in Follow Through during the 1975-76 year arose because of the massive shifting of teachers due to budget cuts at the Board of Education. Follow Through schools were treated the same as all other schools, and the result created near chaos! At the beginning of the year a city-wide teachers' strike to protest the cuts and consequent lay-offs closed the schools. The parents felt helpless: nothing they could do would re-start Follow Through until the strike ended. When the strike did end, the parents watched in horror while more than half of the Follow Through teachers from some programs were excessed and teachers from other schools who had been "bumped" to the Follow Through schools were assigned to Follow Through classes. In the first place, the experienced Follow Through teachers had in most cases been trained to teach according to the highly particularized instructional model used in each Follow Through Program. Almost all of those teachers had elected to join Follow Through in the first place, and, having learned to teach in the program, they became good at it, and enthusiastic about it, and the parents liked and trusted them. The parents were enraged to lose those

teachers, and to have no voice in the assignments of new teachers to the program. The problem became worse when a significant number of the newly assigned teachers indicated that they disliked their new placements, hoped to leave them soon, and meanwhile had no intention of implementing the Follow Through model in their classrooms. (The overwhelming frustrations faced by these teachers, which contributed to many of their negative attitudes, are discussed below. See "Instructional Programs: Teachers." Suffice it to say here that the teachers who "gave up" during this period had some reasons for doing so). The parents, angry at having lost some of their favorite teachers, approached the new ones warily, and too often found their fears confirmed by the teachers' initial attitudes. The final blow came when continuing City budget problems and long-drawn-out grievance procedures filed by large numbers of excessed or shifted teachers combined to produce continuing transfers of teachers among schools. One first grade class had had six teachers by Spring, and that case was far from unique. The parents realized that they could not be sure from week to week or even day to day who would be teaching their children's classes, nor could they do anything about it. Other budget cuts brought still further problems to Follow Through, problems which were also visible to the parents. Most programs had had two paraprofessionals to a class, and were cut to one. Social and psychological services were cut drastically, and many activities were either cancelled or sharply curtailed. In one program, a budget and union problem kept all of the paraprofessionals out of the classrooms for weeks, even after the schools re-opened.

Some parents, feeling that they had been given a false sense of power and control, gave up on Follow Through. Their painfully low morale was

matched by that of many professional participants in Follow Through, and indeed throughout the City school system. Other parents saw the situation in terms of the grave threats it posed to the Follow Through Program and resolved to redirect the energies of their anger and frustration into constructive work to save the program. At the Follow Through sites where a significant number of parents took this attitude, the results were remarkable. Teachers said that parents were supportive and helpful, rather than being hostile, and coordinators and other staff members spoke repeatedly of the countless hours the parents had spent doing volunteer work in the classrooms, working for their Policy Advisory Councils and in general providing the kind of willing help which was so desperately needed all year. By the end of the year, this difference in parent attitudes has made a significant contribution to the morale of the Follow Through staff at each site. As is discussed below (See "The Individual Programs") morale varied from good to terrible among the staffs of the separate programs.

In terms of recommendations for working with parent attitudes about budgets and teacher assignment, the utopian solution would be to single out Follow Through as an experimental program and have teachers assigned separately from the City procedures.

Within the realm of possibility, however, it is recommended that parents, through the Policy Advisory Councils, be given explicit, honest information about what is happening and will happen and what can and cannot be done about it as far in advance as possible. At the same time, the possibilities for constructive action on the part of the parents should be presented as concretely and as persuasively as possible in order to maximize the probability of mobilizing the parents toward constructive effort and positive

attitudes. Principles of group process suggest that the following steps would contribute significantly to the achievement of this goal:

a) The presentation(s) should be made by an upper-level Follow Through official, if possible one who is not connected to the creation of the budget cuts or other problems. This means that the official would ideally come from the federal Follow Through offices, or from the administration of Follow Through in another city.

b) The person making the presentations should be of the same ethnic background as the majority of the parents, i.e. Black or Hispanic.

c) The presentation(s) should be made in a neutral place, that is, neither in the presenter's office nor the parents' school, but in a community center, local church meeting room, etc.

d) Leaders of the parent groups should be invited to a first series of meetings, and they should contribute as much as possible to decision-making. Thus, for example, if the next year or two of Follow Through are like 1975-76, a major goal will be to have the parents contribute as much time as possible to working as parent volunteers in the classrooms. The parent groups themselves should decide how to accomplish this goal, i.e. whether to pay for babysitting and transportation from Policy Advisory Council funds, whether to give parent volunteers special privileges such as the right to go on all Follow Through family trips rather than following a "one trip per family per year" rule, how to recruit and select volunteers, and so on.

e) At group meetings for all parents, the recommendations of the leaders' group should be presented for discussion and for solici-

tation of further ideas, elaborations, and challenges. These meetings, held in the schools, should be chaired by the Policy Advisory Council chairperson, and the presentations should be made by him or her, the Follow Through coordinator, the principal, and any other parent leaders who had attended the leaders' meeting. The goals of this meeting would be to (1) inform the parents, (2) solicit their support and encourage them to help, (3) present the recommendations for action of the leaders' meeting, (4) gather further suggestions, and (5) describe the next steps to be taken. If the group unanimously agrees with all of the recommendations, the next step will be implementation of those proposals. If there have been further suggestions, the parents should be told that they will be discussed at the next Policy Advisory Council meeting, after which parents will be informed of the course of action which is finally chosen. It is important that several things be emphasized in this meeting: the goal of helping the children, the benefits provided by Follow Through which the children would otherwise not have, and the importance of the suggestions voiced from the floor. The last is aided by having someone take notes of the meeting, and by having the leaders of the meeting agree to and incorporate, on the spot, any suggestions which they find useful.

A final problem faced by the Follow Through parents' program is that in some schools, there is a large Hispanic population, but the Hispanic parents are very reluctant to be active in Follow Through. Observations, inspection of lists of Policy Advisory Council officers and committee members,

and verbal reports by Follow Through coordinators and upper-level Follow Through staff all suggest that this happens when Black families out-number Hispanic families. A variety of possible reasons for this exists, including the Spanish-English language barrier, the belief among many Hispanic families that school officials are to be respected and not questioned, and the sense of being foreign and consequent fear experienced by many Hispanic families. Whatever the reason or reasons for Hispanic parents' absence from Follow Through, when it occurs, it would be desirable to change that pattern. A successful approach to the problem was made in one program when a bilingual social worker was hired whose ethnic background was Hispanic. She worked especially hard to involve Hispanic parents in the program and was highly successful in a remarkably short time. Where this approach to the problem is possible, it is strongly recommended. Another approach is to have the Follow Through coordinator, the teachers, and/or some Policy Advisory Council members contact parents individually and ask them to help the program by doing some specific task. It might be to do volunteer work with a particular teacher, preferably one whom the parent knows. Or it might be to shop for a specific list of supplies for the Family Room, or do some other well-defined and non-threatening task. It is especially important for the parents to succeed at these tasks and to feel that they have contributed to the program.

Chapter IV

The Instructional Program

Instruction in the classrooms varies from site to site in Follow Through, over a range from outstanding to unacceptable. In this section, the various aspects of the instructional programs are discussed and evaluated, and recommendations for improvement are made. The particular strengths and weaknesses of each separate program are discussed in the next major section of this report. (See "The Individual Programs".) In this section, the following topics are discussed: the instructional models and roles of the sponsors; the teachers; other personnel in the classroom; staff development and training; instructional materials; trips; reading achievement; achievement in other cognitive areas; affective development of the children; and the special case of the third grades.

The Instructional Models and Roles of the Sponsors

Although the out-of-classroom aspects of Follow Through are quite similar from site to site, as discussed in the preceding sections, great variations emerge when classrooms are visited. The major reason for this is that seven different educational models are in use, and in most cases the classroom instruction prescriptions of the models vary widely. Some models include explicit teaching techniques for all instruction, others do so for only some curriculum areas and others not at all. Those which specify teacher behaviors range from the Bank Street whole-child developmental approach to a behavioristic approach focused on mastery by all children of specific skills.

In general, those programs with the most explicit prescriptions for teachers have the best classroom instruction, based on classroom observations. (The teachers did not know when they would be observed; in most cases they did not know ahead of time that an evaluation was in progress.) As always, in each school some teachers were stronger than others, some very poor teaching was observed in the programs in which most of the teaching was excellent, and some superb teaching was seen in schools in which the instructional programs were in chaos.

It was striking that generally excellent teaching was observed in programs whose philosophical bases for instruction are as disparate as the whole-child and behavioristic models. In both, desired teacher behaviors are made very clear, but those behaviors differ widely between models. Three models and four schools displayed excellence, and in each, the majority of the teachers were following their teaching models and most of the children were working hard and apparently attaining relatively high levels of achievement. More than half of the teachers in each of these schools were rated "good to excellent" and fewer than 10% in each case were rated "poor" on the basis of site visits. About one-third were rated "fair." (See the next section, "The Teachers," for further discussion of this point.)

By contrast, in the four schools in which the teaching model was more diffuse (or, in one case, where there is no specific in-class model), there was a much wider range of quality, and poor teaching was observed much more frequently. The proportion of teachers rated "good to excellent" ranged, in these four schools, from 20% to 45%, between 15% and 40% were rated "poor," and 30% to 60% were rated "fair."

The finding that programs whose models specify teacher behaviors more exactly receive a higher proportion of good teacher ratings may be the result of several factors. One possibility is that an explicit model gives a weak teacher a way to handle a class, which he or she might not be able to do otherwise. The staff trainer's job is also more explicit in these cases, and when a teacher needs help, the staff trainer can find out in what parts of the model the teacher is having trouble and can then supply a prescription. When a group of teachers are all teaching in the same way, they can share a great deal more, both in experiences and materials. They may have a greater sense of community, which often includes having the same problems and dissatisfactions. All of these can contribute to higher teacher morale.

The sponsors of the programs are supposed to help the instructional staff understand the philosophy of the instructional model and to give in-service training in implementation of that model. The sponsors' levels of participation in the Follow Through Programs in the Spring of 1976 were highly varied. Their involvement was very clear and very constructive in the cases of the Bank Street College of Education and the University of Kansas. Their Follow Through coordinators, staff trainers, and teachers felt that they worked in partnership with the sponsors and could rely on them for help. Although the University of Oregon sponsors are seen as strong participants in their program, they have gotten involved in conflicts in the past years both with the Follow Through staff and with the administration of the school in which the Follow Through program is located. Thus the Oregon sponsors are greeted with ambivalence in their program: the Follow Through staff are working hard to create a unified program, and

they need and appreciate the sponsor's help, but they are wary of further conflicts. Finally, the sponsor team from the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation has a unique relationship with its school. According to the Follow Through staff at the school, the High/Scope team began its work several years ago with great enthusiasm and dedication but also with a certain amount of naivete. The sponsor team and the school staff never worked closely on the program and have made many revisions over the years. Everyone agrees that more work is needed, and the Follow Through staff seem to see the sponsor as a hard-working partner more than as an authority to which to turn for answers.

Each of the sponsors discussed above makes mostly strong positive contributions to its Follow Through Program. The same cannot be said for Clark College and the City University of New York, each of which also sponsors a program. The City University - sponsored program was in disarray during 1975-76. This program was initiated and run by New York University from 1968-74. The problems in 1975-76 stemmed partly from the death of the principal designer of this model in 1972, who died leaving the model unfinished, and partly because the program had an acting coordinator until Spring, when a new coordinator was installed. There was little evidence of sponsor participation during site visits.

The model sponsored by Clark College proposes heavy sponsor participation in the home-school partnership which is the core of the program. A handbook says, "As the representatives of home and school plan, work, learn and grow together, gain acceptance and respect for each other, they gradually bring about positive change in both institutional environments and, inevitably, in pupil achievement." (Home-School Partnership Model: A Motivational Approach, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia, 1974, p. 7.) In

order to achieve this goal, the participants in the "partnership" must have common objectives and at least complementary approaches to them. No sponsor help was in evidence in teacher-training. This deficiency should be remedied.

There is one "self-sponsored" program among New York City's Follow Through schools. It is a small program with a variety of strengths, but it is among the programs with poorer classroom instruction. The good teachers do well, but the poor and mediocre teachers need help and at the same time are threatened by the idea that they need it. A consultant could provide assistance without having the teachers lose face; a sponsor could also provide a much-needed theoretical model and a set of explicit goals for the program. The Follow Through staff of the program say that they would like a sponsor, another indication that one would be very helpful.

Two major recommendations emerge from the discussion in this section of the models and their sponsors. First, explicit instructional goals and teaching techniques are needed in every program. They exist and are functioning well in the programs based on the Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, and Systematic Use of Behaviorial Principles models. They are very much needed to help reduce the proportions of poor teaching observed in the schools using the Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, Home-School Partnership, Interdependent Learning, and Self-Sponsored models.

Secondly, active sponsor participation in each program is mandatory. Each sponsor's responsibilities include instruction in the model, in-service teaching for the staff, and individual help for teachers who need it, as well as data-collection and evaluation of the model for research and curricu-

lum development purposes. The Follow Through staff have better working relationships with sponsor representatives when those representatives visit the site on a regular basis, perhaps once a month, and when they are prepared to do classroom instruction alongside the teachers. Thus they can work out or demonstrate actual solutions to very real problems. The representatives should also come prepared to address teachers' and staff members' questions and problems in open working sessions in which the realities of each situation are considered along with the abstract theories.

The Teachers

The Follow Through teachers had a difficult year in 1975-76. Many of them were new, and virtually none of the new teachers had a choice of whether to be assigned to their particular schools or whether they wished to participate in Follow Through. In addition, the Follow Through budget was cut, and consequently class sizes grew - to as many as 35 children per class in some cases - and support services were decreased. Throughout the Spring, interviews with Follow Through teachers showed that they are fearful of further cuts, of being moved or moved again, losing the Follow Through Program altogether. New Follow Through teachers sometimes resisted changing their teaching strategies to fit the Follow Through models, and they found support for their resistance among others who felt as powerless and as buffeted as they. Add to these problems the continuing frustrations that had led to the September teachers' strike and its unsatisfactory resolution and the anger and resentment of many of the Follow Through parents which was discussed above, and the picture is bleak.

In spite of all of the above, there is excellent teaching in some Follow

Through classes and indeed in some entire programs. A large block of time during each site visit was devoted to classroom observations, and the following discussion is based on those observations. All visits were made by a single evaluator, who discussed her findings with the Follow Through coordinator of each program and sometimes with the school principal. An attempt was made to visit each class at least once, and to make a subsequent visit if the first one had been at an inopportune time. On the basis of these observations, each teacher was rated "good to excellent," "fair," or "poor." The criteria used in making these ratings were: whether the teacher was following the teaching model if there was one for that program, whether the teaching was comprehensible to the children, whether a rich variety of materials was available to the children, whether the teacher displayed warmth and whether the children were paying attention and working. The Follow Through coordinators' evaluations of the teachers coincided with the evaluator's in almost every case.

Program - by program results of this evaluation of teaching are presented in Table 1. The percents are rounded to the nearest 5% because of the global nature of the assessment.

Several points might be emphasized from Table 1. First, the highest proportions of good teaching and the lowest proportions of poor teaching occured where the models specify what the teacher is to teach and what instructional techniques should be used. At each of the first four sites listed in Table 1, more than half of the teachers were rated "good to excellent," and fewer than ten percent were rated "poor." This cannot be accounted for in terms of teacher experience, because a large number of teachers at those sites were new to Follow Through, nor is it the result of the size of the

Table 1

Proportions of Teachers Rated "Good to Excellent" and "Poor" at Each Follow Through Site

Sponsor & Model	Number of Teachers Observed	Total Number of Teachers	% Rated Good to Excellent	% Rated Poor
Univ. Kansas Behavior Analysis	11	11	65%[1]	10%[2]
Univ. Oregon Behavioral Principles	11	12	65%	0%
Univ. Kansas Behavior Analysis[3]	8	8	60%	0%
Bank Street College of Education	18	23	60%	5%[2]
City U. of N.Y. Interdependent Learning	13	15	45%	15%
Clark College Home-School Partnership	11	13	35%	25%
High/Scope Cognitively Oriented Curr.	10	15	30%	40%
Self-Sponsored Model	10	10	20%	20%

Notes:

1) All percents rounded to the nearest 5%.

2) This figure represents one teacher.

3) This sponsor has two sites and the same model is used at both.

programs, for both the largest and smallest programs are included. Neither is it the result of a particular kind of school setting, because in some of the programs the classes were dispersed throughout the schools while in others they were all close together, and, finally, the school buildings themselves ranged from modern, bright, and cheery plants to old buildings with peeling paint which were dreary at best.

It is also interesting to note that approximately a third of the teachers at each site except that which is self-sponsored were rated "fair." These teachers were usually strong in some ways and weak in others, and this proportion held up across all the models. This is to say, perhaps, that a certain number of teachers will do a job which is passable but not really good in any of a wider range of circumstances. Where there was a teaching model, most of these "fair" teachers used it, but with a number of errors and quite a lot of confusion in the classroom. Where there was no explicit model, they usually worked from the books and curricula supplied by the school.

Where teachers were rated "poor," their classes had been chaotic upon observation, and the teachers themselves were usually very harsh. These teachers' classrooms were usually barren - no books or other educational materials on display, no children's work or art projects on bulletin boards, nothing to look at. The teachers tended to yell at the children, to criticize them harshly, and to punish frequently. Most of them seemed to have given up, some in rage, and others in despair.

Teacher morale varied from program to program. In general, it was better in the more highly structured programs, where the teachers knew what goals they were working toward and how the theory suggested the teaching should

be done. These teachers felt they received more help than other teachers did, partly from the sponsors and partly from the rest of the Follow Through staff. The exception to this was at the site using the Systematic Use of Behavioral Principles model, where a large number of teachers were frustrated by the model and the sponsor representatives - (See further discussion below under "The Individual Programs.")

Teacher morale also tended to be higher when the Follow Through classes were grouped together in one area of a school. This produced more of a feeling of participating in a special project and working as part of a team.

Recommendations which focus on the Follow Through teachers include the following:

1) Teachers should be given a choice of joining Follow Through or not.
2) New Follow Through teachers should be given a comprehensive orientation to the program as a whole, as well as to the instructional components, and should be given intensive inservice training by the sponsors.
3) All teachers should use the materials available in the Resource Rooms much more than they do. Staff meetings might be held in the Resource Rooms, just to bring the teachers there and get them to look at the materials.
4) In some programs, there are undercurrents of bad feelings among the teachers, sometimes toward the sponsors, sometimes toward the entire Follow Through Program, and sometimes toward their peers and co-workers. In these cases, small group meetings with trained group leaders are recommended to bring these kinds of problems out into the open and to help the teachers take problem-solving approaches to them.
5) The single teaching technique in which many if not most teachers were

weak was in question-asking. Inservice workshops in this area would help.

Other Classroom Personnel

One of the great strengths of the Follow Through Program is its paraprofessional staff. Another is the group of parent volunteers. A third is the dedicated groups of staff trainers.

Most of the paraprofessionals have been in Follow Through much longer than the teachers - many since the inception of the program, in fact. As a whole, they are excellent at their jobs, which vary from program to program but all of which involve a lot of teaching.

The contributions of the parent volunteers to the classrooms have been discussed above. They tend to be careful, conscientious workers who enable the teachers to do many things they otherwise could not do. They also apparently handle their role relationships with the teachers and paras very skillfully.

Finally, the Follow Through staff trainers deserve the highest praise. They seem to have developed their roles to fit their particular programs, and those roles encompass a tremendous range of activities, ranging from working with individual children to accompanying classes on trips to making curriculum materials to training new teachers, parent volunteers, and paras. They work directly with the sponsors on all matters relative to the curriculum and teaching procedures. The staff trainers do a lot of demonstration lessons for the teachers and paras, and those lessons which happened to be observed were excellent. They are also seen as resource people by the teachers, who turn to them for ideas, materials, and help. At the same time, they provide a real boost to morale in the programs, because

they are available to share problems and frustrations as well as to provide help. The staff trainers are very enthusiastic about their jobs and say that they feel highly rewarded for all of the hours of work they devote to Follow Through.

The children of Follow Through receive an extra benefit from all of the people involved in the program: a lot of people know every child. Thus when the child enters school in the morning, he or she is greeted several times - by the coordinator or nurse perhaps, by a couple of teachers and perhaps several paras. This makes the children feel important, and it also creates a sense of a tightly-knit stable community whose members know and care about their children.

The major recommendation about the other classroom personnel involves the paraprofessionals, who need more inservice training in mathematics. Many paras were observed teaching math while the teachers taught reading; in fact, that pattern is prescribed in some of the models. While it is a good idea to have the paras specialize in one area, math is very complex. One must understand the basic concepts thoroughly in order to teach math correctly, and many paras are weak in that area. Thus, many workshops, both in the content and basic concepts of math and in methods of teaching it are needed.

Secondly, the paras and parent volunteers need to work on their question - asking techniques, just as the teachers do. Inservice training is recommended.

Staff Training and Development

Staff training functions much better in the programs with specific teaching models than in the others. Although workshops on a variety of topics are offered during the year in the latter programs, they seem to be perceived as isolated events which it is difficult to integrate into each teacher's individual styles and techniques.

In the programs using the Cognitively Oriented, Home-School Partnership, and Interdependent Learning models, the recommended teaching procedures are still being developed, insofar as they exist at all, and so staff training involves many changes and contradictions.

The large numbers of new teachers in many of the programs last year made staff training especially necessary and, at the same time it was difficult, given school conditions at the beginning of the year.

The following additions and modifications are recommended:

1) Intensive training should be given to new Follow Through teachers at the beginning of the year by sponsor staff and Follow Through staff, including opportunities to observe in classes being taught by teachers experienced in the model.
2) Staff development for experienced Follow Through teachers might begin by asking those teachers to work together to develop a list of common problems which might be the topics of workshops and to suggest additional topics of general interest.
3) Continuing workshops should be offered for the paraprofessionals and parent volunteers.
4) Staff morale is enhanced by socialization among Follow Through personnel;

therefore, opportunities for even brief social contacts should be developed wherever possible. Having coffee available at staff meetings and setting aside the first few minutes for informal visiting is one such possibility.

Instructional Materials

The Follow Through Program does an excellent job of acquiring instructional materials for the teaching staff. Many of these materials are in Resource Rooms, which are available to both teachers and paraprofessionals. Usually one non-teaching staff member has the responsibility for being especially familiar with the Resource Room materials, for keeping track of them when teachers borrow them, and for keeping them organized in the Resource Room itself. The budgets for purchasing and renting these materials are generous, and the funds seem, for the most part, to be used wisely.

The major problem with the Resource Rooms, as suggested in the section on Teachers, is that teachers go to them relatively infrequently. In fact, the paraprofessionals, on the whole, make better use of these resources than the teachers. The best way to approach this problem is to bring the teachers to the Resource Room for some specific purpose such as for meetings. Once there, they might learn more about what is available.

Many Follow Through classrooms are delightfully full of resource materials and supplies. Books, plants, animals, educational games, and arts and crafts supplies abound. The walls are gaily decorated with posters, with charts and graphs made by the class, and with children's work. In several rooms, one whole wall in each was covered with a mural made by the class. These murals were outstanding, and they were clearly the results of a lot

of work by everyone and a lot of learning by the children.

Whether or not a particular Follow Through classroom is interesting and cheerful looking depends entirely on the teachers and paras. Such rooms were observed at every site, no matter how decrepit the building itself was. It is perhaps worthwhile to try to help teachers whose rooms are barren and dreary to fill them with cheerful and interesting things; possibly the teachers' morale would be helped by such an effort.

A major item in some of the earlier Follow Through budgets was the purchase of special equipment for Follow Through classrooms. Typewriters and phonographs, the latter often with multiple headphones, were among the most frequently purchased. Although most Follow Through classrooms have typewriters, only two were seen in use in the course of over one hundred classroom observations. Phonographs were in fewer classes, but were seen in use slightly more frequently. Their use was apparently frequently recreational rather than as part of a lesson.

The recommendations which emerge in relation to instructional materials are, thus, (1) to involve teachers more in the Resource Rooms, (2) to help teachers who do not do so to display a rich variety of educational materials and resources in their classrooms and encourage children to use them, and (3) limit the maintenance of special machines such as typewriters for classrooms unless they are specifically required in the curriculum and are used to greater purpose.

Trips

Most Follow Through classes make several trips per year. Observations of class discussions as well as of wall charts and children's stories and

drawings suggest that most of the teachers do a great deal of teaching through these experiences.

In addition, each Policy Advisory Council has the option of using some of its monies for trips for parents and children. The range of such expenditures proposed by the Policy Advisory Councils for 1975-76 was from none to almost $2,000. (See Table 2.)

It seems likely that many of the parents who go on the "family trips" also volunteer to go on the school trips as parent helpers. The children go on school trips regularly; indeed, relatively few of them go on any given family trip, so that the actual expenditure per child on family trips is higher than the amounts listed in Table 2.

Altogether, in light of all of the budget problems faced by the Follow Through Program, it is recommended that the Policy Advisory Councils carefully review their expenditures for family trips. Before committing themselves to large expenditures, they should examine the other ways in which they might spend some of their funds. Then they can decide what investments will, overall, be most beneficial to their children. This is not to recommend that family trips be dropped from Follow Through, but rather to say that their numbers in some programs might be reduced.

Table 2

Expenditures for Family Trips Included in Policy Advisory Committees' Proposed 1975-76 Budgets

Follow Through Site	Approximate Number of Children in Follow Through Program	Proposed Budget for Trips	Approximate Allocation per Child in Program
1	250	$ 824.00	$3.26
2	300	260.00	0.89
3	350	1,297.00	3.74
4	375	0.00*	0.00
5	375	1,992.50**	5.31
6	425	177.50	0.42
7	450	700.00	1.59
8	600	1,300.00	2.20

*The sponsor of this site specifically discouraged parent trips.

**Family activities outside of the community are an integral part of the model for this site and are actively encouraged by the sponsor.

Reading Achievement

Having discussed the various components of the Follow Through instructional programs, an evaluation of some of the outcomes is next. In this section, the Follow Through children's reading achievement is examined. In the following two sections other cognitive achievements and affective development of the children are discussed. Finally, the third grades of the Follow Through Program are examined.

One set of data strongly suggests that Follow Through children generally do better in reading than they would have if they had not been in Follow Through. Those data are presented in Table 3. The analysis is based on a comparison of Spring 1976 reading scores with scores predicted by historical regression for the Spring from pretest scores obtained in 1975.

Table 3 shows that in kindergarten, first, and second grades the children scored much better in Spring tests than had been predicted from their pretest scores. The differences are all highly statistically significant. This pattern is dramatically reversed in the third grade, where the children performed significantly worse than had been expected.

Longitudinal data comparing reading achievement of children who were in Follow Through for four years (grades K, 1, 2, and 3, 36 to 40 months), with those who were in Follow Through for less than four years (i.e. 1 to 35 months) and with a sample of those who were never in Follow Through are presented next, in Table 4. It should be noted that the only children included in this analysis are those for whom reading test scores for five years (through grade 4) are available. Scores for the same children, tested in grades K, 1, 2, 3, and 4, appear in Table 4. The "never in Follow Through" groups were originally selected from schools in the same

Table 3

Comparison of Spring 1976 Reading Test Results With Those Predicted by Historical Regression from 1975 Pretests

Test Used	Form Pre	Form Post	Level Pre	Level Post	Total N	Group (Grade)	Number Tested[1]	Pretest Date	Pretest Mean	Predicted Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest Date	Actual Posttest Mean	Obtained Value of t	Value of p
Boehm	A	B	-	-	674	K	419	10/75	.028	.028[2]	5/76	.934	19.858	<.001
SESAT	-	-	II	II	837	1	455	10/75	.671	1.139	5/76	1.789	12.847	<.001
SAT	A	NYC	Prim II	Prim II	869	2	515	10/75	1.812	2.381	4/76	2.911	13.268	<.001
SAT	NYC	NYC	-	-	850	3	580	4/75	3.101	4.034	4/76	3.257	-13.781	<.001

Notes:

1) Number of pupils for whom both pre - and posttest data were available.

2) In normal curve deviate units (from percentile ranks.)

types of neighborhoods as Follow Through schools, and the schools originally included families in the same ethnic and socioeconomic groups as Follow Through families were. Some of the neighborhoods serving those schools have since changed, usually to include more people from higher socioeconomic groups and more children from Oriental backgrounds. Thus they are probably not as similar to the Follow Through population now as they were originally. It should also be noted that all public schools in New York City which serve large numbers of families from the lower socioeconomic levels receive various kinds of supplementary funding for special academic help for the children. Thus there is no actual group of "control" children like that theoretically described in Table 3 in the Predicted Posttest Mean column; such "control" children would be placed in public schools in deprived neighborhoods and would receive no special services. It is not possible, from the information available, to discribe who the "never in Follow Through children" are, and what their educational experiences are like. Thus their value as a control group is limited.

The data in Table 4 show that differences by grade are the main contributors to the variance among the Follow Through children's reading test scores. However, there is also an effect which reaches borderline significance in the time in program by grade interaction. This means that at grade 4, those children who were in Follow Through for four years do better than their counterparts who were in Follow Through for less than four years, although this difference did not appear at the earlier grade levels.

In Tables 5, 6, and 7 analyses of variance are presented which substantiate the above findings. In each table, the numbers of subjects in all three groups are increased by dropping the requirement that their test scores

Table 4

Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades K, 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never.

Time In Follow Through

Grade	4 years (36 - 40 mo.)	Less Than 4 Years[6] (1-35 mo.)	Never[6]	Row
K - Mean[1]	27.676	27.588	27.338	27.534
1 - Mean[2]	40.574	41.000	42.138	41.237
2 - Mean[3]	51.221	52.784	53.508	52.504
3 - Mean[4]	56.368	57.078	57.877	57.108
4 - Mean[5]	68.412	64.784	66.385	66.527
Column				
Mean	48.850	48.647	49.449	48.982
SD	7.405	8.475	8.842	
N	68	51	65	

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Time in Program	105.007	2	52.504	0.155	ns
Pupils	61,347.188	181	338.935		
Grades	164,112.375	4	41,028.094	986.062	<.001
Time in Prog. X Grade	610.513	8	76.314	1.834	.068
Grade X Pupils	30,124.211	724	41.608		

Notes:

1) Metropolitan Primer Test, 1972.

2) Metropolitan Primary I, 1973.

3) Metropolitan Primary II, 1974.

4) Metropolitan Elementary Reading Test, 1975.

5) Conversion from New York City Reading Test Scores, 1976.

from the earlier grades be available. The characteristics of the groups remain the same, that is, the "four year" group was in Follow Through for 36 to 40 months, the "less than four year" group for 1 to 35 months, and the "never" group not at all. In each of these tables (5, 6, and 7) the time in program by grade interaction is highly significant, and when the number of children in the "never in Follow Through" group is substantially increased in Tables 6 and 7 (as before, by dropping the requirement that test scores be available for the earlier grades), it can be seen that the four-year Follow Through group scores better than either other group.

An attempt was made to study the contribution of a preschool experience in Head Start or an equivalent program to success in the Follow Through Program. It proved to be impossible to do a reliable analysis because there were so few children who had been in preschool for eight or more months and in Follow Through and for whom reading test scores were available for grades 1, 2, 3, and 4. The analysis of variance appears in Table 8. Reading test scores were averaged over grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 for this analysis, and the children were grouped according to whether they had been in preschool from 0 to 7 months or 8 or more months. No conclusions can be drawn from this analysis due to the very small sample of children from Head Start or other preschools.

Finally, the relationship between children's attendance and their reading scores was studied grade by grade. The results appear in Table 9. Surprisingly, they suggest that, at least in first and second grade, children who are absent more often have higher reading scores. The correlations are small throughout, and are not significangly different from zero for the kindergarten and third grades. It is interesting to note, as shown in

Table 5

Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never.

Time In Follow Through

Grade	4 years (36 - 40 mo.)	Less Than 4 Years (1-35 mo.)	Never	Row
1 - Mean [1]	40.288	40.457	42.416	41.054
2 - Mean [2]	50.886	51.630	53.517	52.011
3 - Mean [3]	55.977	55.580	58.960	56.839
4 - Mean [4]	68.644	63.531	67.946	66.707
Column				
Mean	53.949	52.799	55.710	54.153
SD	8.689	10.099	9.856	
N	132	81	149	

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Time in Program	1,936.256	2	968.128	2.680	.070
Pupils	129,705.500	359	361.297		
Grade	115,234.188	3	38,411.395	968.058	<.001
Time in Prog. X Grade	1,293.094	6	215.657	5.435	<.001
Grade X Pupils	42,734.094	1,077	39.679		

Notes:

1) Metropolitan Primary I.

2) Metropolitan Primary II.

3) Metropolitan Elementary.

4) Conversion from New York City Reading Test Scores.

Table 6

Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades 2, 3, and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never.

	Time In Follow Through			
Grade	4 years (36 - 40 mo.)	Less Than 4 Years (1-35 mo.)	Never	Row
2 - Mean[1]	51.829	50.661	51.876	51.455
3 - Mean[2]	56.138	55.521	57.748	56.469
4 - Mean[3]	68.354	63.264	65.907	65.842
Column				
Mean	58.773	56.482	58.510	57.922
SD	8.963	10.798	10.436	
N	181	121	226	

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Time in Program	1,553.750	2	776.875	2.567	.078
Pupils	158,870.625	525	302.611		
Grade	52,648.707	2	26,349.352	736.012	<.001
Time in Prog. X Grade	1,171.718	4	292.929	8.182	<.001
Grade X Pupils	37,590.180	1,050	35.800		

Notes:

1) Metropolitan Primary II.

2) Metropolitan Elementary

3) Conversion from New York City Reading Test Scores.

Table 7

Analysis of Variance Data on Reading Scores in Grades 3 and 4 of Children Who Were in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never.

Time In Follow Through

Grade	4 years (36 - 40 mo.)	Less Than 4 Years (1-35 mo.)	Never	Row
3 - Mean[1]	56.010	55.544	57.685	56.413
4 - Mean[2]	68.104	63.154	65.908	65.722
Column				
Mean	62.057	59.349	61.796	61.067
SD	9.583	11.954	11.768	
N	193	136	238	

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Time in Program	1.599.832	2	799.916	3.234	.041
Pupils	139,483.250	564	247.311		
Grade	23,299.430	1	23,299.430	730.499	< .001
Time in Prog. X Grade	1,059.194	2	529.597	16.604	< .001
Grade X Pupils	17,988.918	564	31.895		

Notes:

1) Metropolitan Elementary.

2) Conversion from New York City Reading Test Scores.

Table 8

Analysis of Variance to Compare Reading Scores of Children Who Had Had Preschool Experiences With Those Who Had Little or No Preschool; Children Had Been in Follow Through for Four Years, Less Than Four Years, or Never.

Time in Follow Through		Preschool 0-7 months	Preschool 8 or more mo.	Row
4 years (36-40 mo.)	Mean[1]	53.967	54.281	54.124
	SD	8.672	8.278	
	N	121	8	
Less than 4 years (1-35 mo.)	Mean	53.175	48.000	50.587
	SD	10.245	.354	
	N	73	2	
Never	Mean	55.707	51.510	53.609
	SD	9.930	9.965	
	N	94	25	
Column	Mean	54.283	51.264	52.773

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Time in Program	502.367	2	251.184	0.696	ns
Preschool Experience	470.430	1	470.430	1.303	ns
Time in Prog. X Preschool	294.951	2	147.475	0.408	ns
Pupils	114,461.938	317	361.079		
Grade	17,764.707	3	5,921.566	147.226	.001
Time in Prog. X Grade	328.922	6	54.820	1.363	ns
Preschool X Grade	58.166	3	19.389	0.482	ns
Time Prog. X Presch. X Grade	113.208	6	18.868	0.469	ns
Grade X Pupils	38,250.039	951	40.221		

Table 10, that children in Follow Through are absent significantly less each year than they had been in the previous year.

The preponderance of the evidence provided by all of the above reading score data suggests that Follow Through children read somewhat better than non-Follow Through children when they reach the fourth grade, and that they read far better than they would be expected to read if they were not in a special program of some kind. However, the classroom observations conducted in the course of this evaluation suggest that one critical analysis has been omitted, namely, a comparison of reading scores among the Follow Through Programs. This is an **obvious omission.** The data needed for this comparison were not made available to the evaluators. However, the observation data strongly suggest that the children in the programs following the Bank Street, Behavior Analysis, and Systematic Use of Behavioral Principles models read far better, on the average, than children in the other programs do. If this is true, then exceptionally good reading scores from some programs are combined with generally low scores from others to produce overall average scores.

The single recommendation to be made about the Follow Through reading program is that reading scores be compared on a program-to-program basis. It is only fair to the Follow Through team in each school, including administrators, staff, and parents, to inform them of how well their children learn to read in their own program. The reading scores would provide a source of pride for some and a concrete goal for others. Where reading was observed to be poor, classroom instruction was also relatively weak; one could expect that improved instruction would lead to higher reading

Table 9

Relationships Between Attendance and Reading Scores in Follow Through Classes Grades K, 1, 2, and 3.

Grade	Year	Number of Children[1]	Days Absent	Correlation: Reading Score[2] + Days Present	Value of t	p
K	1971	189	Mean 20.92 SD 16.72	+ .09	+1.35	ns
1	1972	282	Mean 17.70 SD 14.56	- .25	-5.11	<.001
2	1973	354	Mean 14.48 SD 15.96	- .16	-3.18	<.01
3	1974	243	Mean 12.64 SD 14.84	- .08	-1.34	ns

Notes:

1) Children for whom number of days absent and reading score for that year were available.

2) Reading Tests:

K: Metropolitan Primer.

1: Metropolitan Primary 1.

2: Metropolitan Primary 2.

3: Metropolitan Elementary.

Table 10

Analysis of Attendance Data for Follow Through Children, Grades K, 1, 2, and 3.

Grade	Mean Days Absent	SD of Days Absent	Value of t	df	p
K	20.92	16.72			
			2.22	469	< .05
1	17.70	14.56			
			2.64	634	< .05
2	14.48	15.96			
			1.43	595	.08
3	12.64	14.84			

scores, among other things.

Achievement In Other Cognitive Areas

Classroom observation data suggest that a great deal of instructional time is spent teaching mathematics in the programs with explicit classroom instruction programs, and relatively little is spent in math in the other programs. This leads to the hypothesis that achievement in mathematics is as varied as reading achievement among the various programs. Where math was taught regularly, the children seemed to enjoy it. The only question which arose was a theoretical one: what are children learning when they are doing addition and subtraction purely by enumeration (i.e., counting) when they are too young to understand the concept of number and thus cannot conserve number? This problem arose in kindergartens and first grades where children were seen solving addition and subtraction problems purely by using counters, and never generalizing from nor seeming truly to understand their activities. Whether this is helpful or harmful to later achievement in mathematics is as yet unresolved.

The other curriculum areas which seemed to be the subjects of frequent lessons were social studies and language arts. Good teachers generally taught these well and poor teachers not so well.

Handwriting is emphasized in some of the models, and there, the children worked hard on it. Handwriting has been an unpopular subject during the recent past but seems to be enjoying new popularity now, and those programs in which it is part of the daily curriculum will doubtless produce children with better scripts. How important that is is a matter of per-

sonal values.

The one curriculum area which would seem to deserve more attention than it receives in Follow Through classes is science. Science lessons and projects were very rarely observed during the field visits, and many Follow Through teachers said they felt insecure in science instruction.

Overall, when good teaching was going on, it was in all areas of the curriculum. When bad teaching occurred, the children may have learned some affective lessons and some methods of pleasing and provoking teachers, but they did not learn anything prescribed by teachers' guides. The only major recommendation about the other curriculum areas is that science teaching be increased, which in turn implies that the teachers and/or paras need some inservice work in science context and curriculum.

Affective Development of the Children

Two major goals of Follow Through are to help the children develop accurate, positive self-concepts and to teach them how to get along with each other. Again, observational data suggest that these goals are by and large accomplished, more in programs where children can see that they are working hard and learning, and more in the lower grades than in third grade.

In the great majority of the classrooms, the children were typically warm and friendly, both to each other and to the observer. They helped each other willingly, asked the observer for help in a trusting way, and readily showed their work. Furthermore, they talked with each other a lot, sharing social experiences, answering questions, and resolving disputes. Many of the Follow Through teachers used extra moments to encourage these behaviors

by getting children to talk about - or in one case, sing about - the things that were important to them.

Positive self-esteem and good social relationships are highly related to each other, and myriad anecdotes reflecting both could be recounted. The teacher behaviors which contributed constructively to these goals include displaying warmth, praising genuinely, giving constructive criticism and explicit directions, and maintaining discipline mainly through praise with occasional matter-of-fact (but not angry) punishment. Furthermore, these teachers enjoyed and respected the children, and the children knew it.

Only a passing comment is needed about the negative affective development going on in the classes of angry, discouraged teachers. Even in the earliest grades, many Follow Through children have reserves of rage and fear which they express when they are angry and threatened. Thus children who lost control of themselves were often violent, and the teachers in whose classes this happened often seemed totally helpless - a fact which made the children feel even worse.

Affective education is still new in most published curricula, and many teachers shy away from it personally, especially when they have children who have many good reasons for anger and fear. Yet, again and again when teachers have begun talking with children about feelings - teachers' feelings, children's feelings, others' feelings - they have found that their children have grown enormously in self-esteem. More of this kind of teaching is recommended for Follow Through, with the hope that the accomplishments to date in affective development can be extended even further.

The Third Grade

The examination of the overall characteristics of the Follow Through instructional program cannot be completed without a special discussion of the third grades. Although Table 11 shows that the third grade teachers as a whole were rated better than the first or second grade teachers, both the reading score data and classroom observations of the children suggest that the third grades in Follow Through are less successful than the other grades in all aspects of the instructional program.

In reading test performance, it will be recalled from Table 3 that the third graders achieved much lower scores on the posttest than had been predicted from their pretest performance. It had been predicted that, without the special benefits of Follow Through, their posttest mean score would be 4.034 (in grade equivalent units). Whereas the children in the other Follow Through grades scored much higher than had been predicted, the third grade posttest mean was 3.257, a gain of only .156 grade equivalent units or about one and one-half months over the pretest mean from a year earlier. Practically speaking, the posttest score shows no meaningful gain during the third grade year. This finding is supported by the longitudinal data of Tables 4, 5, and 6 where the year-by-year increases in scores are smaller between second and third grades than between K and 1, 1 and 2, or 3 and 4, for both the four-year and the less-than-four-year Follow Through groups.

Classroom observations revealed that third graders, both boys and girls, displayed a great deal more anger, restlessness, and anxiety than children in the other grades. It was not unusual to hear a third grader talk back to a teacher or to see a child refuse to do what the teacher asked. These

Table 11

Percent of Teachers in Each Grade Rated "Good to Excellent," "Fair," and "Poor" in Follow Through.

Grade	Number of Teachers Rated	Percent "Good to Excellent"	Percent "Fair"	Percent "Poor"
K	23	70%	26%	4%
1	24	50%	33%	17%
2	20	25%	50%	25%
3	23	52%	39%	9%

behaviors were rare in the other Follow Through grades. Similarly, third graders fought both verbally and physically quite frequently, sometimes for no apparent reasons. Finally, and most surprisingly, perhaps twice as many children were observed sucking their thumbs as in any other grade. Both boys and girls engaged frequently and actively in this regressive behavior, which is usually considered to be a symptom of stress.

Why are the third grades so different? A detailed study is needed to produce firm conclusions. Here, some hypotheses are proposed for inclusion in such a study. First, the children themselves seem very different from the younger Follow Through children. They seem physically bigger, emotionally older, and cognitively more mature than children in the "early childhood" years are expected to be. Cognitive theory supports this hypothesis: most developmental theories state that children have different cognitive capacities - different and more sophisticated ways of thinking - after age 7. Working from this theory, it can be proposed that third grade children live in a wider world than younger children, and that they examine their surroundings more critically. When Follow Through children begin to look at their neighborhoods critically and to compare their standards of living to those they see on television and in other parts of New York, while on Follow Through trips, they have reason to be threatened and angry. It seems probable that this and other discoveries about the harsh realities of their lives are made by third graders.

At the same time, many of the third grade curricula in Follow Through involve phasing out Follow Through instructional models and having the children change to the curricula followed in the upper elementary grades. This change is often confusing to the teachers as well as the children,

and there is an impression of instability and uncertainty about curriculum goals. Indeed, the upper-grade classes must do without the extra staff and materials which characterize Follow Through, so that the children are often moving into classes which lack the riches of their earlier classes.

The primary recommendation about the third grades is that they be studied to find out what really is happening and how changes can be made. Secondarily, while such a study is in progress, it would probably be helpful to design a major portion of the third grade curriculum to focus on the children's own lives, how they compare to others' lives, and how the children feel about being who they are. The social studies area would seem appropriate, with special emphasis on affective education. Children of this age can begin to examine emotional behaviors critically, make comparisons among them, and, within limits, they can choose their own models.

Finally, every attempt should be made to stabilize the third grade curriculum so that the children know not only what is going on at any given time, but also what will happen in the future, while they are in transition from Follow Through to the upper grades.

Chapter V

The Individual Programs

1. The Bank Street model, sponsored by the Bank Street College of Education.

   Strengths of this program, which is the largest among the New York City Follow Through Programs, include very good leadership, three dynamic staff trainers, a superb social worker, and apparently high teacher morale. The classrooms, by and large, are rich with materials, and the model is almost always implemented by the teachers. The sponsor provides excellent services, and a sponsor representative is at the school very frequently. The parent volunteers enjoy their work and are well trained.

   There are relatively few problems. They include the need for more parent volunteers, and the fact that efforts to involve fathers have not succeeded.

   Recommendations for the program are as follows: (1) A full-time psychologist who knows the community is needed. (2) Paraprofessionals would function more efficiently if they had specific tasks and responsibilities.

   Overall, this is an excellent program, and everyone who participates in it does so with enthusiasm. This includes the children.

2. The Behavior Analysis model, in two school, sponsored by the University of Kansas.

The strengths of this program at both sites are: it is a clear, explicit model which works well when teachers implement it; children work hard and apparently develop excellent skills; and the parents are very enthusiastic about the program.

Implementation of the model is very different in the two schools. Intervisitation is strongly recommended, perhaps by two or three teachers or paras at a time. The staff trainers should definitely observe in each others' programs. More communication among the staff is needed in the school where the Follow Through classrooms are dispersed over three floors, and it would be good to group the classrooms together on one floor. In the older building, classrooms tend to be large but dreary, and decoration by large murals would be a good idea. In the same school, the principal gives strong support to Follow Through, but teacher morale is low. Group sessions with the teachers are recommended to bring out the problems and try to solve them. Paraprofessionals at both sites need much more training in math, which might be done cooperatively.

A particular strength of this model is that each adult in the classroom has a specific subject to teach. This helps the paras and parent volunteers immensely.

3. The Systematic Use of Behavioral Principles model, sponsored by the University of Oregon.

The instructional model of this program provides both a major strength and a major weakness: its strength is its highly structured behavioristic teaching format, and the problem it creates is that some teachers

don't want to use it. Relationships between the sponsor and the Follow Through staff, which have been strained recently, need to be improved so that teachers can discuss their problems with sponsor representatives and receive realistic, practical help. The role of the staff trainer needs to be worked out so that teachers will feel free to call upon her and she will be able to make specific suggestions. Group work with the entire staff is recommended to set common goals and air the problems which are present but not discussed.

Overall, this model is working very well, although the staff does not feel sufficiently rewarded for their efforts.

4. The Self-Sponsored model.

This program is in a small school in a relatively pleasant neighborhood. It has many strengths, including an excellent coordinator and a pleasant school building. The children are independent, they talk with each other, and they read well.

More than anything, this program needs consultant assistance to clarify the instructional model. These changes would improve morale in the program and provide a way of helping weak teachers improve their instruction.

5. The Home-School Partnership model, sponsored by Clark College of Atlanta, Georgia.

The instructional component of this program is in disarray. Since there is no in-class instructional model, teachers are on their own. Some are good, but in too many classes bored children and punitive

teachers were observed. Although the theoretical strength of this model is that parents are visited at home and taught to tutor their children, any gains made by the children through such help are likely to be offset by poor teaching at school. In order for this model to work, classroom instruction and home instruction must be tightly integrated.

It is recommended that the sponsor become closely involved with this program, which will be a change, and that the sponsor and staff begin by developing an in-class instructional model and then a coordinated home-teaching model.

The strengths of the model include a very good staff trainer who will become the coordinator in 1976-77, some fine teachers, and a willing group of paras and parent volunteers.

6. The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum model, sponsored by the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation of Ypsilanti, Michigan.

As discussed in the text, the sponsor of this model has had to develop the model itself over the years of Follow Through. At this point, the greatest necessity at the site is to teach the teachers (a great many of whom were new in 1975-76) the model and get them to use it. This is a problem of lack of knowledge and morale among the teachers. Because the program has among its strengths good leadership, good sponsor participation, and strong support from an outstanding school principal, these goals can be accomplished. Marked improvements were noted at the time of the second site visit in June, 1976.

7. The Interdependent Learning model, sponsored by the City University of New York.

As discussed in the text, this program had a newly assigned program coordinator in the Spring of 1976 and did not appear to have a fully developed model. Although attempts have been made to develop the model, it is still somewhat diffuse. Thus the major effort for this program in the coming year must be to complete the development of the curriculum model with the sponsor and to implement it. The basically strong and enthusiastic Follow Through staff is the major strength of the program to date.

Chapter VI

Conclusions, Summary, and Recommendations

Generally, it was found that the Follow Through Program met its goals. Reading scores were higher for Follow Through as compared to non-Follow Through students. When the programs were observed individually, it was found that certain models functioned systematically better than other models. The goals of most of the social services were met despite reductions in the number of professional personnel.

It can be conclusively stated that the program has been functioning satisfactorily. On the basis of observation and statistical data it is recommended that the program be continued into the next year.

Although program recommendations appear throughout the body of this report, the following recommendations are listed for emphasis:

1. Health Services
   a. A full-time nurse should continue to be part of every Follow Through Program.
   b. The same nurse should continue in each program from year to year.
   c. Nurses should have a regular schedule of health lessons with each Follow Through class.

2. Social and Psychological Services
   a. More professional time is needed.
   b. The same social worker and psychologist should be reassigned to each program each year.
   c. Bilingual staff members are a great asset in programs with large Hispanic populations.

3. Parent Involvement in Follow Through

   a. Efforts to involve fathers in Follow Through should be directed to adult activities rather than classroom participation.

   b. Parents should be given complete information about what changes are forced upon the program by budget cuts.

   c. Parents should be involved, according to an outline included in the text of this report, in helping the program rather than criticizing it or withdrawing from it.

   d. Where Hispanic families are reluctant to participate, a bilingual staff member preferably of Hispanic background, should be given special recruiting duties.

   e. Where Hispanic mothers are timid about coming to the school, they should be asked to volunteer to do a specific, non-threatening job at which they will succeed.

4. The Instructional Models and Roles of the Sponsors

   a. Explicit instructional goals and teaching techniques are crucial in every program, and must be developed and refined in the programs using the following models: Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, Home-School Partnership, Interdependent Learning, Self-Sponsored.

   b. Active sponsor participation in each program is mandatory. Sponsor representatives should visit the sites on a regular basis, at least once a month.

   c. Sponsor representatives should do classroom instruction alongside the teachers.

   d. Sponsor representatives should meet with teachers and other Follow Through staff in open problem-solving sessions.

e. The Self-Sponsored program should have consultant assistance.

5. The teachers

a. Teachers should be given a choice of joining Follow Through or not.

b. New teachers should be given a comprehensive orientation to the Follow Through Program.

c. New teachers should be given intensive inservice training in the model used at their site.

d. All teachers should use the Resource Rooms more than they do.

e. In programs where teacher morale is low, meetings with a trained group leader should be held to explore the problems and begin to solve them.

f. Teachers need training in question-asking, and workshops should be given at all sites on this topic.

6. Other Classroom Personnel

a. Paraprofessionals should have a series of workshops in mathematics content and curriculum.

b. Inservice training in question-asking should be given to the paras and parent volunteers.

7. Staff Training and Development

a. New Follow Through teachers should observe in experienced Follow Through teachers' classes.

b. Experienced Follow Through teachers should develop, at each site, a list of topics for staff development workshops for the year.

c. Continuing workshops should be provided for paras and parent volunteers.

d. Socialization among staff members should be encouraged as much as possible.

8. Instructional Materials

a. Involve teachers more in the Resources Rooms.

b. Teachers who do not do so should be helped to display a wide range of resource materials in their rooms.

c. Special equipment for classrooms, especially typewriters, should be maintained only where they are included in a specific part of the curriculum and greater use should be encouraged.

9. Trips

a. Policy Advisory Councils should review their budget allocations for family trips. In some cases they might choose to reduce them in order to invest more in some other aspects of the program.

10. Reading Achievement

a. Reading scores should be compared from program to program and grade to grade over time and analyzed when budgetary considerations permit. This would indicate differences in learning due to program differences as well as the effects of other variables at critical points in time.

11. Achievement in Other Cognitive Areas

a. Science teaching should be increased.

12. Affective Development of the Children

a. More teaching directed toward the children's emotional development should be considered for inclusion in the curriculum.

13. The Third Grade

a. An in-depth study to identify the problems in the third grades and to recommend some solutions should be planned for and implemented when feasible.

b. The social studies curriculum should focus on a critical examination of the children's own lives, with a major emphasis on emotional development and affective behaviors.

c. The curriculum should be stabilized and the children should know how their transition to fourth grade will be made.